

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant:	SYMONS, et al.	Patent Application	
Application No.:	10/005,066	Group Art Unit:	2151
Filed:	December 03, 2001	Examiner:	Tran, N. V.
For:	METHOD FOR DETECTING AND PREVENTING INTRUSION IN A VIRTUALLY-WIRED SWITCHING FABRIC		

REPLY BRIEF

In response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on March 21, 2008, Appellants respectfully submit the following remarks.

REMARKS

Appellants are submitting the following remarks in response to the Examiner's Answer. In these remarks, Appellants are addressing certain arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer. While only certain arguments are addressed in this Reply Brief, this should not be construed that Appellants agree with the other arguments presented in the Examiner's Answer.

Response to Response to Argument of Examiner's Answer

The Response to Argument of the Examiner's Answer appears to assert that "isolates" is equivalent to "determines unexpected addresses." Appellants respectfully disagree with this assertion. As previously presented in the Appeal Brief, Appellants understand the firewall module of Vairavan is not operable for "comparing addresses associated with packets received at a first port in said network with expected addresses for said first port to determine unexpected addresses," as claimed (emphasis added). Instead, per Appellants' understanding, Vairavan may teach filtering based upon source and destination addresses of a packet (page 6, paragraphs 74 and 80 of Vairavan); "content filtering of packets" (page 6, para. 88); "...stateful inspection of a packet to identify states that the packet has completed" (page 7, para. 89); and "...a network intrusion detection mechanism that monitors packet packets transmitted to or from specific device..." for "...anomaly detection and misuse detection," (page 7, para. 90). However, while Vairavan may refer to some certain kinds of filtering, Appellants submit that Vairavan does not teach, suggest, or describe, "comparing addresses associated with packets received at a first port in said network with expected addresses for said first port to determine unexpected addresses," as claimed (emphasis added).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and for reasons previously presented in the Appeal Brief, Appellants continue to assert that Claims 13-22 and 24-38 are patentable over the cited combinations of the Vairavan, Wang, and Holloway references.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: 05/21/2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration Number: 35,398

WAGNER BLECHER LLP
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500